CFOR

2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition NO. 2696 /2003

PETITIONER : C.B. Pradhan, aged 49 Years, S/o Late Balmukund Pradhan Sub-Inspector, Benure, Tahsil Narayanpur, Police District Narayanpur (C.G.)

P. R. No. 2533/03
Presented by Shri A.C. Dubey
dated 20/06/03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department of Home D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur (C.G.)

2. Director General of Police Police Head Quarter Raipur (C.G.)

3. Inspector-General of Police Bastar, District Bastar (C.G.)

4. Superintendent of Police Bastar, District Bastar (C.G.)

RECEIVED COPY
27/8/03
CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

शपथ आयुक्त
एस.के शुक्ला
बिलासपुर (छ.ग.)
13/6/03
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

WRIT PETITION U/A 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUE OF AN APPROPRIATE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS/CERTIORARI ETC. OR DIRECTION/ORDER IN THE LIKE NATURE ETC.

1. **PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER**

As stated above in the cause title.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.2696/03 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

34

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

11.4.2005

Shri L.C. Das, counsel for the petitioner.'

Shri Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for the State.

The petitioner's case is that he is working as Sub-Inspector in the Police Department of State of C.G. Further case of the petitioner is that while his posting as Sub-Inspector, Police Station Benure, District Narayanpur he discharged his duties efficiently with utmost devotion and honesty and during that period he killed one naxalite namely Vijay Bhaskar @ Sukhdeo @ Sukanna. On account of killing of said naxalite, as per the policy, the petitioner is entitled for out of turn promotion and accordingly, a proposal for the same was sent by the Superintendent of Police, Bastar. On 13.5.2003 respondent No.2 promoted seven inspectors and constables but the petitioner's case was not considered by the respondents. Similar order was passed by respondent No.4 on 1.7.2004 but again the petitioner was not considered for promotion.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.1 raising all his grievances and respondent No.1 be directed to decide his representation, to which learned counsel for the respondent has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a representation to respondent No.2 within two weeks from today raising all his grievances and in turn respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law within another three months from the date of receipt of representation after considering all the points raised by the petitioner.

With the direction aforesaid, this petition stands disposed of.
Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge